Pages 1 - 31 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA BEFORE THE HONORABLE WILLIAM H. ORRICK UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, vs. ) NO. CR ADAM SHAFI, San Francisco, California Defendant. ) Thursday January 14, 2016 1:30 p.m. TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS APPEARANCES: For Plaintiff: BRIAN STRETCH Acting United States Attorney 450 Golden Gate Avenue San Francisco, California 94102 BY: JEFFREY L. SHIH, AUSA For Defendant: JOSHUA L. DRATEL, PC 29 Broadway Suite 1412 New York, New York 10006 BY: JOSHUA LEWIS DRATEL, ESQ. LAW OFFICE OF ERIK LEVIN 2001 Stuart Street Berkeley, California 94703 BY: ERIK B. LEVIN, ESQ. Also Present: JOSH LIBBY - Pretrial Services Reported By: Debra L. Pas, CSR 11916, CRR, RMR, RPR Official Reporter - US District Court Computerized Transcription By Eclipse

1	PROCEEDINGS					
2	JANUARY 14, 2016 1:55 p.m.					
3	THE CLERK: Calling Criminal Matter 15-582, USA					
4	versus Adam Shafi.					
5	Counsel, please come forward and state your appearance.					
6	MR. SHIH: Good afternoon, your Honor. Jeff Shih on					
7	behalf of the United States.					
8	THE COURT: Mr. Shih.					
9	MR. DRATEL: Good afternoon, your Honor. Joshua					
10	Dratel for Mr. Shafi, who is being brought out now, and Eric					
11	Levin as well.					
12	MR. LEVIN: Good afternoon, your Honor.					
13	THE COURT: Good afternoon.					
14	PRETRIAL SERVICES OFFICER: Josh Libby, U.S.					
15	Pretrial. Good afternoon, your Honor.					
16	THE COURT: Good afternoon.					
17	(Defendant present, in custody.)					
18	THE COURT: Mr. Shafi, good afternoon.					
19	THE DEFENDANT: Good afternoon, your Honor.					
20	THE COURT: All right. So two things to do today, as					
21	far as I'm concerned. One is to address the status, status					
22	conference. Then the second to deal with the appeal on the					
23	bail application. So let's do the status first.					
24	Mr. Shih put in his brief that this case warranted a					
25	complex designation and that the defense seemed to agree, is					

1 that --2 MR. DRATEL: Yes, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: -- true? 4 Mr. Shih, what is the status of the DOJ review for the use 5 of the wiretap intercepts. 6 MR. SHIH: The process is ongoing. Essentially with 7 respect to the 11 calls -- or, rather, the nine calls in the complaint, and the two additional calls at issue within the 8 detention proceeding, use has been granted with respect to those. 10 11 The issue right now is, as this Court knows from wiretap cases, very infrequently do you just have nine calls in a 12 wiretap. So it's -- it's the process of going through and 13 getting the authority, both authority to use and, also, the 14 15 authority to declassify for us; not just affirmatively, but, also, to meet our discovery obligations even if we're not going 16 to use such information. 17 18 So with respect to, you asked what is the status, we do 19 need to submit our approval for that; but with regard to that, we have had several meetings, both internal -- several meetings 2.0 21 internally to discuss that with the appropriate channels, both at the FBI and at the DOJ in order to do that. 22 23 In addition, we are in the process of making sure that the 24 defendant has all discovery that we can currently produce to 25 them. In fact, I have some disks that I'm ready to produce to

the defense counsel today.

2.0

2.1

We have an updated protective order that I can hand up to the Court. And there may be some future amendments, but the parties are working through and so we may file an amendment to it to allow the defense counsel a little bit greater latitude than the protective order currently requires, but this at least allows us to produce what I have ready to produce to defense counsel right now.

But I do -- you know, given the nature of the case, we do foresee this being a more lengthy process than normal. That said, this is something that I will be extremely diligent and forthcoming about to get defense counsel discovery that they are entitled to in a timely manner and as early as I can.

THE COURT: And without holding you today to any sort of date, how long do you think it's going to take in order to get the case ready for trial?

MR. SHIH: Well, I think there's two steps to that. I think the first step is getting the defense the discovery that they are entitled to. And then after that, there is the issue of -- there may be quite a bit of litigation in this case.

And so in terms of -- I think your Honor's question may be when could we potentially foresee going to trial on this case, and I think right now it's a little bit --

THE COURT: Too soon?

MR. SHIH: -- too soon to say.

2.0

2.1

I have discussed it with defense counsel. Given how we're in -- in the sort of the beginning stages of the discovery right now, what we were going to propose to the Court was to set this out approximately 60 days for next status conference, where at some point we could actually talk about setting down some dates.

And, obviously, it's not a case where defense counsel and I are not going to be talking. We will be talking. But we don't want to have a case where, you know, if it comes to the 60 days and we're not ready to discuss substantively setting some dates, what we may end up doing is filing a stipulation and proposed order to set it out a little bit more.

So that's what we're contemplating and that's what we were going to propose to the Court. We had run past a date of March 17th with your Courtroom Deputy, if that is -- if that would be acceptable to the Court.

THE COURT: And that's fine.

Mr. Dratel, what perspective do you have to share on these topics?

MR. DRATEL: I think that we concur in the sense that it's too early to tell in terms of setting a firm schedule.

Obviously, one of the issues for us is the volume of calls. We don't know exactly what the time period is of the calls.

And, also, as an intelligence wiretap, as opposed to a

2.0

Title III, it's not a pertinent versus non-pertinent. It takes every call. So when we do get them, we're going to have to go through essentially the entirety of what conversations occur on any particular day.

And the other part is that the litigation that's involved

in things that are usually either sealed or classified -- and Mr. Shih and I have talked to this a little bit -- does involve some unusual aspects to it. So it would be good to get a handle on the contours of the discovery before getting to that stage.

But the other part is with a protective order -- in fact, we signed the protective order today because we want to get the process moving. And based on the conversations with Mr. Shih, he seems to be amenable to meeting some of our reservations that I think will be done. And then we can leave the Court out of that and submit a modification to the Court with the agreement of the parties rather than litigate it, so to move that forward.

But, obviously, we do have an interest in moving forward. We just -- that's why we're trying to get as much discovery as early as possible so then when we come back on the 17th, we do have a framework for something firmer than that.

THE COURT: Okay, great.

So we'll have the next status on March 17th.

MR. SHIH: With regard to time exclusion, would the

1	Court be amenable to excluding time based on both the						
2	complexity of the case and, also, effective preparation of						
3	counsel?						
4	MR. DRATEL: No objection, your Honor.						
5	THE COURT: All right. Okay. Yes. And if you would						
6	prepare the stipulation. Oh, you've got it.						
7	MR. SHIH: Can I hand it up?						
8	THE COURT: Please do.						
9	MR. SHIH: It's not the order for the time exclusion,						
10	but this is for the protective order.						
11	(Whereupon document was tendered to the Court.)						
12	MR. DRATEL: Your Honor, would that be 1:30 on the						
13	17th?						
14	THE COURT: Yes.						
15	MR. SHIH: There is also one housekeeping matter. We						
16	can take it up after the detention hearing or we can do it						
17	or the detention appeal or we can do it now.						
18	The parties noticed that Mr. Dratel actually has somehow						
19	been terminated off of the docket. There was no motion						
20	THE COURT: Congratulations.						
21	MR. SHIH: or anything like that. So just to						
22	bring that to the Clerk's attention. I don't think I think						
23	you're remaining in the case.						
24	MR. DRATEL: Yes, your Honor. I think what happened						
25	was there was a substitution of Mr. Levin for some prior						

counsel and then they just wiped out everybody, including myself. I wasn't aware of it until I realized this week I didn't get it Government's response on ECF.

So I'll have my office contact the clerks because they have done so before when the case was in a sealed posture and I got added to the case. I think they will be able to figure it out and get me back on board.

THE COURT: Okay, good.

2.0

All right. So the -- with respect to the appeal. I have read all the papers that were before Judge Kim. So the defendant's application for relief, the Government's opposition. I've read the defendant's supplemental motion.

I've read the transcript of the hearing below. I've read the detention order. The defendant's motion for review and the exhibits that were attached, the supplemental motion and exhibits. The Government's opposition. I listened to all of -- yesterday to the CD recordings. And I've reviewed the Pretrial Services report.

So the -- and I've particularly read the letters of the family and friends of Mr. Shafi, and they describe a very generous and idealistic and loving person. And I appreciate the people who wrote and the people who are here today.

And I recognize the family's willingness to be a surety and to try to ensure compliance with the conditions and those -- the various matters that have been offered are in

2.0

addition to a substantial amount for sureties: No contact with the people who Mr. Shafi was speaking with on the recordings, a private guard, electronic monitoring, home confinement, strict reporting to Pretrial, internet restrictions, religious guidance and support, and mental health counseling.

So I see all of that and I understand all of that. And at the same time, the convictions that Mr. Shafi has have been channeled, of late anyway, towards the Al Nusra Front and which the United States Government has designated as a terrorist organization. And the communication — the recordings include some disturbing language and convictions that are very strongly expressed with respect to the Al Nusra Front. And there have been two attempts by Mr. Shafi to leave his family, once when he was in Egypt and the second time last summer.

And so I guess, Mr. Dratel, the issue that I am most concerned about and I don't know that -- it's a hard one to address, is the flight risk. And given the concern of the family from before, that's the thing that I'm most concerned about.

And, Mr. Shih, I am -- you made very clear, and correctly so, separating out the conditions of confinement from this determination. But I am concerned about the conditions of confinement.

I am concerned about Mr. Shafi being in administrative segregation over a long period of time. I'm concerned about

the seizure of religious material and family photographs. I'm concerned about the intrusion into privileged materials that was alleged.

And so I'm hoping that in addition to responding,

Mr. Dratel, that you will be addressing those issues, because
that's not a tenable situation.

So, Mr. Dratel, go ahead.

2.0

2.1

MR. DRATEL: Thank you, your Honor.

And I'll address -- because I know the Court, obviously, has looked at this and has focused on this particular issue, so that's what I'll address, which is essentially how unusual this case is in that context in terms of trying to -- in terms of establishing conditions and imposing conditions that remove the risk of flight sufficient to give the Court a comfort level.

And, also the concept -- that the benefit of the doubt should go to the defendant in a bail context, even in a presumption context, because bail is really the fault and detention not, because it's the Government's burden.

So, but in terms of how unusual and unique this case is, I look at it sort of from both sides, one is the affirmative conditions that the Court can impose to limit and really eliminate the possibility of Mr. Shafi leaving, which is, again -- and the Court went through them.

And electronic monitoring on its own in the vast, vast majority of cases, I don't even know of cases now where people

2.0

2.1

are able to get away on electronic monitoring. You add private security. You add other types of restrictions, contact restrictions, all these things, it becomes a powerful, overwhelming, affirmative set of conditions imposed by the Court to prevent flight.

The second part is, there are really three components.

The second part is that he doesn't have the wherewithal to do

it. In other words, he can't live out there on his own. His

parents are his financial support. His community is his

emotional support. They are all here because they want to help

him fight through this case. Not to flee. But to fight

through this case.

They are aware of the nature of the charges and they are here because of who he is. And they know him better than a series of conversations and/or a snippets from nine conversations over the course of a month's time. And we don't even know what the full range of those conversations is. Six months. Nine months. We don't know. So that's important.

The other part that's important is I think that in the context of the family -- and I give the Government credit for the argument, but I think it distorts the nature of what it is because this is what also makes this case unusual, which is that to take the family's very active efforts to keep Mr. Shafi out of harm's way, turned around as if somehow they have failed and that's why he shouldn't get bail.

1 THE COURT: I don't think they failed at all and I don't think that's what the Government was suggesting. 2 3 I think what the Government is suggesting and the thing 4 that is concerning is that Mr. Shafi found his way from Egypt 5 to Turkey when he was on a family vacation in Egypt and he just 6 left. And it is very concerning that he told his family that 7 he was going to go study on whatever it was, June 30th, and then -- and then went to the airport to go. 8 9 And the statements that Mister -- there is a long way between now and the time of trial, but the statements that are 10 11 in the recordings show a really deep conviction that is 12 concerning --13 MR. DRATEL: I understand, your Honor. THE COURT: -- to the Government and to me. 14 And when I'm looking at making this determination, I -- I 15 16 don't want you to try to turn this on the family. 17 MR. DRATEL: No, I --18 THE COURT: Because the family, I think, and the 19 community, I have nothing but the greatest respect for the 2.0 support that they are showing. 2.1 MR. DRATEL: And, your Honor, that was sort of my 22 point in the sense that the family's efforts beforehand can't 23 be a reason now to say: Well, nothing can hold him. Because 24 the Court has the authority to do so in a way that is effective

and proves effective in cases. And what you have, in addition

25

to that is what I'm saying, is a family that is fully committed to enforce those conditions in a way that we don't have in every case.

2.0

And this really is an unusual case of a family involvement. And oftentimes families are -- you know, they benefit from criminal activity or they enable it in other ways. And here we have the exact opposite from an entire community of people.

And the first trip, Egypt to Turkey. He can't get to

Egypt now. He can't get away because he will be in his house

with belt and suspenders, the way the Court can set it up. The

way we've proposed it.

He can't get to the airport to fly. He can't get somewhere without travel documents where he could get -- he can't get away -- it's proven effective in so many cases and the -- all of these other factors, the family, the community, the full range of conditions that the Court can -- that the Court can impose can eliminate the risk of flight.

And so the -- just to talk about the nature of the charges, is that we don't -- while there are strong convictions expressed, we don't believe that they meet the standard of the statute, the conduct.

And that's another part, is that words are one thing, conduct is another. And travel was made to Turkey, but he didn't join a group there. He came home after two days. He

stayed in the airport, a home to refugees.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

So, and even what the Government alleges in the complaint about conversations, he declined to go. There is a section where -- in Paragraph 32 it says: Then you didn't want to go, the other person to the conversation says.

So conduct did is really the issue here, as opposed to an expression or language that's isolated from conversations that we haven't seen the full range of and that, I think, will portray a very different intention, a very different set of objectives for Mr. Shafi, and not to join a terrorism group. Not to commit violence.

His whole history is -- and, you know, the family unit is a strong unit and I understand what has happened, but the fact is the moral situation part is a very important aspect here. The family is going to be putting up its home, and the bond will be beyond that amount, I assume, you know, in terms of security. It's just a portion of what the bond would be. And he -- he knows what the consequences would be. And he's not going to do that.

One thing that the conversations also establish is his involvement in his family and he's not going to turn that down.

You know, he -- it's interesting, though. conversations after the airport are interesting because there is a resignation that he's not going and he never tries. a three-day period before he's arrested, where the Government

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

has him under 24-hour surveillance, as it notes in the complaint -- not the complaint, in the Government's papers. They now have 24-hour surveillance and there is not a single scintilla of any evidence that there is any plan, any intention, and -- any resuscitation of an intention to go. that part is done.

And what he has to do now is concentrate on this case because regardless of what's in the papers with respect to discussions, there was never a plea offered by us to anything. I mean, we never -- like I said, I don't think these -- these conversations and conduct meets the standard of the statute and I think to a certain extent, except with getting online to -and even afterwards he's not arrested.

You know, the Government could arrest someone and write a They don't need to write a complaint to complaint afterwards. arrest someone if they believe a crime is committed. So we have this long period of surveillance. And the level of surveillance is reviewing the family trash, reviewing the family phone records, reviewing the family financial records. All this stuff happened before and there is nothing in there that goes to the offense.

And so I think with all of that, I think that there are conditions that the Court -- and, you know, the conditions of confinement that the Court -- you know, I don't know how, as a lawyer, to be responsible in this way, where I have a client

who is in custody and the facility takes his private papers that are privileged, that are actually memoranda to counsel and 2 to the investigator, takes them and shows them to the FBI and This happened doesn't return them. They haven't returned yet. December 23rd and he doesn't have them back yet. How is he going to prepare this case like that? How am I supposed to tell him: No, go ahead, it's okay. When he's at the mercy of someone coming in and doing that again. And everybody has -- you know, the Court has authority, but we know what happens in prisons; that it happens on a realtime basis and we don't know what's going to happen. So I think that all of that combined is sufficient, and that the Government has aren't met its burden because it's still the Government's burden. And in this case, given all of 14 these factors and, you know, all of the elements that go toward eliminating the risk of flight. I think in a real world situation where the default position is release, that we've gone as far as we can go and it's -- what I mean by that is unless you have a crystal ball that says it can't happen, but I don't think -- it's not going to happen.

What I'm saying is besides that, we have done -- all those conditions do everything to do that and do it sufficiently.

Thank you, your Honor.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Mr. Shih.

MR. SHIH: Yes, your Honor. I'm going to start with the conditions of confinement, which your Honor highlighted that you would like the Government to address.

THE COURT: Okay.

2.0

MR. SHIH: I think we made it clear in our papers that at least the prosecution team is not directing or participating in that.

That said, I gather by the Court's question that you do have concerns about essentially is this happening and is there a justification for it, et cetera. And to that end in the context of the -- these -- the litigation on detention, I did contact County Counsel for Alameda County. They are the ones that essentially represent the Alameda County Sheriff's Office that runs the Glenn Dyer detention facility. They do have a -- and I highlighted for them the pages of the defendant's brief in which they allege that the segregation, the searches, the interviews are happening as a violation of his rights.

So they are aware of that. I spoke to them about it. They know about this bail slash detention hearing.

And we know that the issue of bail and detention are separate from the issue of conditions of confinement. But one of the things that they told me is they said that they were willing, ready and able and they actually wanted to be heard if there was some type of motion on conditions of confinement.

And to further that end, right before the hearing started

2.0

2.1

today, I spoke with defense counsel and I said: Maybe a first step in that is for me to put county counsel and defense counsel in touch with one another because county counsel is actually -- first of all, they are the ones that represent the detention facility, the ones that decide what their standard procedures are, to decide to execute their standard procedures in the searches and in the administrative segregation.

And then, secondly, the conditions of confinement are not something that the prosecution team -- we would rather not be involved in that, as I think the Court may or may not understand.

I mean, yes, we do want the defendant detained, but as far as whether or not he is in administrative segregation or the general -- the general population, we realize that that's not our role. And so that's why I spoke to defense counsel before the hearing started and told him that I would put the two of them in touch.

If there is additional litigation, I understand county counsel is willing to appear and speak on their behalf and give an explanation of essentially what happened and what the justification was and if there need to be any remedial measures, at least be heard on what those might be.

So I don't know if that -- at least that provides the Court with a little bit more information on that.

But moving on to the issue of detention. I wanted to

respond to a couple of -- a couple of different points.

2.0

2.1

Number one. It's come up in the briefing, as well as the investigation, when the defendant and his family were interviewed that the defendant was going over to Turkey to check on the refugees. And I think that listening to the recordings, the recordings contain evidence that's quite contrary to that, where he's talking about the mirror of the Al Nusra Front. And I think that the Court -- I can see that the Court heard those in its statements about the convictions that were expressed on the recordings. There is nothing in there about that was the reason why he was going to Turkey.

The conduct of not telling his parents everything, that's inconsistent with going over there to check on refugees. The purchase of one-way tickets. The discussion with family member right after June 30th where they were laughing about how the FBI asked a very straightforward question of whether or not the defendant was going over to join a terrorist organization and the analogy that they discussed was: It's as if you were doing something extremely illegal and a cop pulls you over and says, "I just want to talk."

There is no incredulousness of they can't -- the FBI can't get it through their heads that I'm just going over there to visit refugees.

So I think the claim that he's over there to check on the refugees is undercut by the evidence before the Court.

2.0

The second thing that I wanted to address was how in the three-day period after the second attempt on June 30th, how he never -- he never tried.

And because your Honor listened to the recordings, you probably -- there were -- I think there were two or three calls on the same day as when he tried to make the attempt. He was -- he was -- on June 30th he was leaving. And as part of that, he did question: Maybe I was wrong to go. Maybe this shouldn't have happened. That's why the FBI showed up.

The last call that was included on July 1st, this is the very next day, and he's talking with one of his confidants, S.K. And in that recording he discusses -- and this addresses the argument about moral suasion and his parents as well. He's discussing how his parents are getting destroyed and how he feels bad about that. And he discusses that at minute 30, and minute 41:15.

But after he discusses those things, at about the hour mark that's where he what's a statement of: I wonder how much evidence the FBI would need before putting me in custody.

Acknowledge after that at minute 1:10 and 1:19, this -the S.K. and the defendant begin discussing how they can bring
a nice camera so they can make the representation to their
parents that they are just going to go over there to document
stuff.

And at minute 1:19 the defendant states: How can you ever

be happy if you don't do anything?

2.0

2.1

So this is a day after his second attempt on June 30th was foiled. He has acknowledged the effect that he is having on his parents in this call and, yet, he's already contemplating going on a trip when S.K. discusses how he might be going two months later.

So that -- that's the -- I'm going to move on to the next point. The next point that I'd like to discuss is the financial dependence on his parents.

In the recordings he discusses with his confidants, there is a lot of updating about: Do you have enough money? How much money do you have right now? And essentially he doesn't need -- the amount that he needs in order to get over there on a flight, his plane ticket is roughly about \$1,000. You're not talking about tens of thousands of dollars. And when he goes, he doesn't have that much money. So it's not just to purchase the ticket. He doesn't need that much.

And I think one of the things to think about is there are -- unfortunately, there are others out there that lend monetary support that don't go on their own.

I mean, one of the examples of that is cited by the defendant and that's the case of Armin Harcevic, right? He has been charged and what he was charged for in that indictment was one -- was essentially -- I mean, he joined the conspiracy, but the one overt act is contributing \$1,500, which would be --

which would have been enough to finance the defendant getting over there.

2.0

2.1

Moving on to the next point. As far as him not being able to get -- without a passport, not being able to flee. I think that is undercut by the recordings again, where he has discussed how he would attempt to get around the no fly list, going through Greece, getting on a boat. There is discussions about how even though Mexico City is far away, how he can get down there.

And I think the Court probably understands while there is border port checkpoint to get into the United States from Mexico, there is no check on a regular basis to leave the United States to get into Mexico.

He has stated on the recordings how he will do what it takes. He's not worried about the FBI. If he -- once he knows what he wants to do, he's going to get it done.

It's the convictions that are also evidenced in some of the letters, how -- not in the context of what he is charged with, but how he is a very focused individual and how if -- if he puts his mind to something, how he'll get it done.

And I think with respect to flight, it's not just fleeing internationally. At least I tried to make the point in our papers, that it's not just a question of a potential flight internationally posing a danger to where the Al Nusra Front operates.

2.0

2.1

His conviction and his statements of spilling some gallons of blood before he meets Allah. That -- one of the things that is scary is that that doesn't necessarily require his flight from the United States. So that is part of our argument as well.

Going through -- I think the question that you asked Mr. Dratel was to focus -- well, you said one of the main things that you were -- that the Court was concerned about was flight. And to -- I think one of the things to think about is the resolve that he has demonstrated that is before the Court that he's not going to be deterred. And the Government's argument is both one of flight and danger, but the Court has highlighted flight.

So the defendant has demonstrated this resolve that he won't be deterred in several different ways.

Number one, he's indicated through his -- through the recorded phone calls that he's not taking direction from what the U.S. laws say. He's not taking direction from what the FBI says. And he's not taking direction from what his parents repeatedly tried to counsel him not to do. In fact, he's taking direction from a belief that the United States is 100 percent the biggest enemy by far on the earth. Right? That's what's driving him.

Number two. He's demonstrated that there hasn't been an effective deterrence. As this Court has noted, that he has --

this was his second try. The first time he went to Turkey, he got away. The second time he was contacted by law enforcement. 2 3 And there is evidence that he was already contemplating 4 possibly doing a third. And that was one day after his -- his 5 attempt on June 30th was filed. So it wasn't had an effect 6 three times.

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Number three. He's demonstrated a contempt in what he has stated on his recorded phone calls. He views -- when he was stopped on June 30th, one of the things that he said was: You know, what am I going to do here? I can't just live in the community here. I would rather be in jail. Living in the community here would be like -- would be betraying Muslims. Right? That's a contempt for the -- the way of life here.

He's demonstrated a contempt for United States law enforcement in stating -- in making several statements regarding the FBI. And he's also made statements about how the way of life in the United States -- how he doesn't want to live life here and how he believes that the wrath of God will come down on the United States.

Number four. He's -- with the second attempt he's demonstrated unpredictability that he's willing to work on his own. And that's even with FBI's investigation, the parents' monitoring. That's with -- you know, he didn't even tell his confidants, A.N. and S.K.

And the way that he explained him going on June 30th was

2.0

2.1

he just decided if he saw -- if he found his passport, he would go. That would be it. That's all he needed. There wasn't much planning involved. There wasn't much coordination involved.

The next point with regard to how he's not going to be deterred for him, he's stated repeatedly: Obstacles are not a big deal. The recording on June 2nd talking about going through Mexico, a boat through Greece. How Egypt is "hella disorganized," in his words.

June 4th talks about Mexico City International Airport.

July 1st, and this -- I think I'm repeating myself: If I know what I need to do, I'm going to do whatever. I don't really care what it takes. And if I need to leave the country I will just take a boat, whatever. It's no big deal.

He's demonstrated that he's willing to hide what he's going to be doing; hiding from his parents, family and friends.

The letters indicate that he has -- I would submit to the Court hidden these things from many of them.

He has told the FBI, he's claimed that he -- he has made this claim in the interviews to them that he was just going there for -- to look at the refugees.

In the recorded phone calls he's demonstrated, you know, when they talk about Abraham Lincoln, they are almost mocking "Why would you be honest?" in response to his question.

And, lastly, with respect to his resolve, why he will not

be deterred, how the conditions of -- how there are no reasonable set of conditions. He's demonstrated that nothing 2 3 really is going to persuade him or nothing was going to persuade him not to leave and to go forth on his convictions. 5 His family tried. His friends tried. He was willing to leave 6 them both behind on a one-way ticket. He was willing to leave 7 all of his -- any of his possessions. He was willing to leave the United States, which has been his home his entire life. 8 9 I understand that cuts both ways in the weighing of detention, but he was willing to leave everything behind. 10 And perhaps most seriously, he was -- he was willing to 11 leave his life behind, as in he was willing to die. This is --12 13 this is why -- this is why there is no reasonable set of conditions. 14 15 So with that, your Honor, unless the Court has any questions, the Government would submit that their -- the United 16 States would submit that we've more than met our burden with 17 18 respect to the factors of 3142(g). There is a presumption in this case. We do submit he 19 2.0 should be detained based on risk of flight and danger to the 21 community, as there is no reasonable set of conditions that can 22 mitigate those risks. 23 THE COURT: Mr. Dratel. 24 MR. DRATEL: Thank you, your Honor. 25 Just as a preliminary, some of the calls, particularly the

July 1st call, we don't have. So we only got nine. They are using 11.

2.0

2.1

It's very difficult for us to talk about context, talk about the specifics of them not having heard them. And even the ones that we have heard, the Government today has gone far beyond what's actually in the conversation to really theorize its case and interpret based on -- so, for example, there is no expression anywhere that he said, "I'm going to Turkey to join Al Nusra." There is no expression anywhere that says that.

They are putting together a jigsaw puzzle that has four pieces and it's a picture of a horse.

THE COURT: Just remember I did listen to everything. So you don't have to argue to me what's in those tapes.

MR. DRATEL: Okay. Thank you, your Honor.

But, also -- and, you know, what's in those calls is a lot of talk about refugees and concern for people on a humanitarian level that in retrospect when you think about where we were before June of 2014, there were a lot of people paying attention to it. So the frustration level on that point is valid.

But I want to go back to the risk of flight issues. That is really what the Court has focused on. What the Government hasn't said is how is he going to do it? You've got electronic monitor. You've got home confinement. You've got a private security force. You've got chaperones from the family and even

from the community, if the Court wants to. 2 I mean, we get it not so much that he needs additional 3 chaperones for that purpose, but just to show you the 4 confidence that the community has that this is a person that 5 should be out on bail and he will not run. 6 So, but it's also, how is he going to? He has no money. 7 He has no documents. He has no assistance from people who he might rely on. 8 9 THE COURT: I know all of this, Mr. Dratel. MR. DRATEL: All right. Sorry. 10 And, also --11 THE COURT: What I'm interested in, if there is a new 12 13 argument or response that you wanted to make to Mr. Shih, I'm 14 happy to hear it. MR. DRATEL: Okay. Here is what it is. We didn't 15 talk about -- in my initial presentation is some the stuff 16 about the conditions of confinement. 17 You know, they talk about the facility. I mean, they sent 18 19 two people in to him. We don't even know yet who they are. 2.0 The Government doesn't even tell us who they are. Two people 2.1 came in and started talking to him about the facts of this 22 case. And he first declined to speak with them. He said: 23 don't want to speak to them. They came to his cell. 24 So they are not outsiders. They are not people that just 25 wander into the facility. They are not social visitors. So

I've no confidence in that regard. 2 Oh, and we will take the Government up on it, but -- I 3 hope it's academic, but the point being that, you know, I would 4 take the Government up on it. 5 But the other part is, well, we talked about even at the 6 beginning of this proceeding is the time, the time it's going 7 to take to get this case to trial. In fact, I don't know that they have the facility where he is right now that he's going to 8 be able to review these recordings and then make notes and not have them taken from him. And make notes. I don't even know 10 if they have the facility to do it even on a computer or 11 12 anything. 13 This is a very, very difficult case to prepare in that regard because of the nature of the evidence and, also, because 14 of the restrictions on the way we can use it and the time that 15 16 it's going to take to get there. 17 And, also, we're not trying the case now. That's the 18 least important part of the Court's consideration under the 19 case law. I just -- I don't want him sentenced before we try 2.0 the case. 2.1 Thank you, your Honor. 22 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 23 So I'm going to affirm what Judge Kim determined.

the commitment and resolve, at least as shown in those

Mr. Shafi, I do think you're a flight risk. I think you have

24

25

recordings, to do anything that you can to leave this country. 2 And there is -- I appreciate all of the conditions that 3 your family is willing to put up in that regard, but it's just 4 not sufficient in light of the recordings. 5 So I am -- I'm going to deny the appeal and affirm that 6 determination. 7 Mr. Shafi, I am concerned about the conditions and while I understand the prosecution is dealing with the prosecution and 8 the sheriff needs to deal with the conditions of confinement. That's not good enough for me. And I don't -- I want to have a 10 very complete explanation as to -- after Mr. Dratel and County 11 Counsel have met-and-conferred, over what those conditions of 12 13 confinement will be. Administrative segregation where Mr. Shafi is out of the 14 cell one hour every two days is not at first blush something 15 that seems tenable for a very long period of time. 16 17 Mr. Shafi has a community of family and friends. 18 to get a complete picture of what his confinement is going to 19 be like. 2.0 And I do think that there are so many of the alternatives 21 Mr. Dratel has outlined is not totally out of the question if 22 the Government is unable to provide a reasonable pretrial 23 detention for Mr. Shafi. 24 So I will hear about that, I'm sure, later on after you've

But I want you to, Mr. Shih, convey that concern, okay?

25

met.

1	MR. SHIH: I understand, your Honor.							
2	THE COURT: All right. So we have Mr. Shafi, we							
3	have a hearing set in about 60 days. Mr. Dratel, if you want							
4	to come back before then with respect to detention issues, I am							
5	here.							
6	MR. DRATEL: Thank you, your Honor.							
7	THE COURT: On Thursday afternoons, all right?							
8	MR. DRATEL: Thank you.							
9	THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much.							
10	MR. SHIH: Thank you, your Honor.							
11	(Proceedings adjourned.)							
12								
13								
14								
15								
16								
17								
18								
19								
20								
21								
22								
23								
24								
25								

CERTIFICATE	OF	OFFICIAL	REPORTER
-------------	----	----------	----------

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

Lletura X. Pard

Debra L. Pas, CSR 11916, CRR, RMR, RPR
Thursday, February 11, 2016